UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
United States Patent and Trademark Office
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS
P.O. Box 1450
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
10/620,711	07/16/2003	Weiling Peng	HARD1.063A	9592

97338 7590 08/30/2010

James Hardie Technology Limited
Europa House
Harcourt Centre, Harcourt Centre
Dublin, DUBLIN 2
IRELAND

EXAMINER	
GILBERT, WILLIAM V	

ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER
3635	

MAIL DATE	DELIVERY MODE
08/30/2010	PAPER

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

The time period for reply, if any, is set in the attached communication.

Office Action Summary	Application No.	Applicant(s)	
	10/620,711	PENG, WEILING	
	Examiner	Art Unit	
	WILLIAM V. GILBERT	3635	

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --

Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) OR THIRTY (30) DAYS, WHICHEVER IS LONGER, FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133). Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

Status

1)☒ Responsive to communication(s) filed on *17 June 2010*.

2a)☒ This action is **FINAL**. 2b)☐ This action is non-final.

3)☐ Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

Disposition of Claims

4)☒ Claim(s) *80-85* is/are pending in the application.

4a) Of the above claim(s) _____ is/are withdrawn from consideration.

5)☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are allowed.

6)☒ Claim(s) *80-85* is/are rejected.

7)☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are objected to.

8)☐ Claim(s) _____ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

Application Papers

9)☐ The specification is objected to by the Examiner.

10)☐ The drawing(s) filed on _____ is/are: a)☐ accepted or b)☐ objected to by the Examiner.

Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).

Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).

11)☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119

12)☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).

a)☐ All b)☐ Some * c)☐ None of:

1.☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.

2.☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. _____.

3.☐ Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).

* See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

Attachment(s)

1) ☐ Notice of References Cited (PTO-892)
2) ☐ Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948)
3) ☒ Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO/SB/08) Paper No(s)/Mail Date *3/16/10, 7/9/10, 7/12/10*.
4) ☐ Interview Summary (PTO-413) Paper No(s)/Mail Date. _____.
5) ☐ Notice of Informal Patent Application
6) ☐ Other: _____.

DETAILED ACTION

This is a final Office action.

- Claim 1-79 are cancelled.
- Claims 80-85 are pending and examined.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103

1. The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

> (a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negatived by the manner in which the invention was made.

The factual inquiries set forth in *Graham* **v.** *John Deere Co.*, 383 U.S. 1, 148 USPQ 459 (1966), that are applied for establishing a background for determining obviousness under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) are summarized as follows:

1. Determining the scope and contents of the prior art.
2. Ascertaining the differences between the prior art and the claims at issue.
3. Resolving the level of ordinary skill in the pertinent art.
4. Considering objective evidence present in the application indicating obviousness or nonobviousness.

Claims 80-85 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Weiss (U.S. Publication No. 2002/0195191) in view of Johnson (U.S. Patent No. 5,178,924).

Claim 80: Weiss discloses an assembly of fiber cement products (paragraph [0059]) arranged in a stack (paragraph [0024]), the product has a non-adhesive finish layer (paragraph [0060], the paint), with a protective layer (22). Weiss does not disclose the specific limitations of the protective layer. Johnson discloses a removable release layer made of a separate polyethylene (Col. 4, lines 55-60) film, and a second separate layer that would function as an adhesive made of ethylene acrylic acid (Col. 4, lines 67-Col. 5, lines 25; the friction layer adheres the release layer to above layers of similar material when in a stacked position). It would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to use the release layer in Johnson with the panel in Weiss because the release layers serve the same function and would operate in a similar manner. One of ordinary skill in the art would place the adhesive layer against the painted layer in Weiss in order to prevent unwanted movement of the layer. Further, the obvious combination does not specifically state that the material does not leave a residue; however, the combination of the prior art meets the structural

limitations as claimed, and would therefore meet the functional limitation of not leaving a residue on the finish layer or tear on removal, which is obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art.

Claims 81-83: The combination of the prior art of record does not disclose the specific thickness of the layer as claimed, however, it would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to have this limitation because optimizing a limitation will not support patentability of subject matter encompassed by the prior art unless there is evidence indicating such a limitation is critical. See M.P.E.P. §2144.05 "[W]here the general conditions of a claim are disclosed in the prior art, it is not inventive to discover the optimum or workable ranges by routine experimentation." *In re Aller*, 220 F.2d 454 (CCPA 1955) (Claimed process which was performed at a temperature between 40C and 80C and an acid concentration between 25% and 70% was held to be *prima facie* obvious over a reference process which differed from the claims only in that the reference process was performed at a temperature of 100C and an acid concentration 10%.)

Claim 84: the combination of the prior art renders obvious that the members are banded together (Weiss: paragraph [0024]).

Claim 85: while the combination of the prior art notes that the panels are stacked (Weiss: paragraph [0024]), it does not disclose that the panels are on a pallet. The examiner takes Official notice that it is well known in the art to place stock materials, such as panels, on a pallet in order to aid in ease of transport and to provide a base support for the stack of materials.

Response to Arguments

2. The following addresses applicant's remarks/arguments dated 17 June 2010:

Applicant's remarks with respect to the claims are respectfully not persuasive. Applicant argues that the Johnson reference would be inoperable in combination with the Weiss reference (both cited above) because the release layer in Johnson is used in combination with an adhesive based surface, and the release layer in Weiss is not. The examiner respectfully notes that the combination of Weiss in view of Johnson results in applicant's claimed invention, and that since the result is applicant's claimed invention, the combination of the prior art would operate in the manner as claimed. Further, See M.P.E.P. §2145 where "[a]ny judgment on obviousness is in a

sense necessarily a reconstruction based on hindsight reasoning, but so long as it takes into account only knowledge which was within the level of ordinary skill in the art at the time the claimed invention was made and does not include knowledge gleaned only from applicant's disclosure, such a reconstruction is proper." *In re McLaughlin*, 443 F.2d 1392 (CCPA 1971). As a result, the examiner maintains the rejection as proper.

Conclusion

3. Applicant's amendment necessitated the new ground(s) of rejection presented in this Office action. Accordingly, **THIS ACTION IS MADE FINAL.** See MPEP § 706.07(a). Applicant is reminded of the extension of time policy as set forth in 37 CFR 1.136(a).

A shortened statutory period for reply to this final action is set to expire THREE MONTHS from the mailing date of this action. In the event a first reply is filed within TWO MONTHS of the mailing date of this final action and the advisory action is not mailed until after the end of the THREE-MONTH shortened statutory period, then the shortened statutory period will expire on the date the advisory action is mailed, and any extension fee pursuant to 37 CFR 1.136(a) will be calculated from the mailing date of the advisory action. In no event,

however, will the statutory period for reply expire later than SIX MONTHS from the date of this final action.

Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to WILLIAM V. GILBERT whose telephone number is (571)272-9055. The examiner can normally be reached on Monday - Friday, 08:00 to 17:00 EST.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Richard Chilcot can be reached on 571.272.6777. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 571-273-8300.

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see http://pair-direct.uspto.gov. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free). If you would like assistance from a USPTO Customer Service Representative or access to the automated information system, call 800-786-9199 (IN USA OR CANADA) or 571-272-1000.

/W. V. G./
Examiner, Art Unit 3635

/Basil Katcheves/

Primary Examiner, Art Unit 3635